# There Is An Equivalence Relation Whose von Neumann Algebra Is Not Connes Embeddable

Aareyan Manzoor a2manzoo@uwaterloo.ca

#### Abstract

 $MIP^*=RE~[Ji+22]$  was used to prove the existence of a non Conness embeddable tracial von Neumann algebra. Recently, similar ideas were used in [BCV24]; [Bow+24] to give a negative solution to the Aldous-Lyons conjecture: there is a non co-sofic IRS on any non-abelian free group. We define a notion of hyperlinearity for an IRS and show that there is a non co-hyperlinear IRS on any non-abelian free group, which reproves the main results of [BCV24]; [Bow+24]. As a corollary, we prove that there is a relation whose von Neumann algebra is not Connes embeddable.

# Contents

1	Introduction	1										
2	Invariant Random Subgroups2.1 The algebra of an IRS2.2 Co-hyperlinear IRS	<b>3</b> 5 8										
3	Non-Local Games3.1Strategies3.2NPA hierarchy3.3Separation	<b>11</b> 12 16 20										
4	Further Directions	<b>21</b>										
Bi	Bibliography											
BI	bliography											

# 1 Introduction

One of the biggest problems in von Neumann algebras was the Connes embedding problem, which asked if each tracial von Neumann embedded into an ultrapower  $R^{\omega}$  of the Hyperfinite  $II_1$  factor R in a trace preserving way. This is a finite dimensional approximation property. This problem was famous because it turned out to be equivalent to several different problems all over operator algebras, but also in quantum information theory. See [Gol21] for detailed discussions on different equivalent formulations of this problem.

The landmark quantum complexity result MIP<sup>\*</sup>=RE [Ji+22] showed a negative solution to the Connes embedding problem through a long chain of equivalences. However, this proof was very non-constructive, essentially showing that if each tracial von Neumann algebra was Connes embeddable: then the Halting problem would be decidable.

So one of the goals is to describe such a von Neumann algebra. Another goal is to narrow down the class of von Neumann algebras where there is a non-Connes embeddable algebra. The best partial result is in [CDI22], where they proved each  $II_1$  factor embedds into a  $II_1$  factor with property (T), and so there is a property (T)  $II_1$  factor that is not Connes embeddable. We improve this by proving:

**Theorem 1.1.** There is some Property (T) ergodic countable probability measure preserving relation  $\mathcal{R}$  so that the property (T) II<sub>1</sub> factor  $L(\mathcal{R})$  is not Connes embeddable.

For each group  $\Gamma$  one can associate a tracial von Neumann algebra  $L(\Gamma)$ , and one question is whether the class of group von Neumann algebras have a non-Connes embeddable algebra. The groups whose von Neumann algebra is Connes embeddable are called hyperlinear. Another finite approximation property for groups is soficity. Roughly speaking: hyperlinearity gives the group an approximation by finite dimensional matrix groups, while soficity gives an approximation by finite groups. Each sofic group is in particular hyperlinear [ES14]. So an easier problem than asking "is there a non-hyperlinear group?" is "is each group sofic?".

The best partial result to this is in [Bow+24], where they disproved the Aldous-Lyons conjecture. This showed that among invariant random subgroups (IRS) of a free group, there is a non co-sofic IRS.

An invariant random subgroup (IRS) of a group  $\Gamma$  is a Borel conjugation invariant probability measure on its set of subgroups. These objects generalize the notion of a normal subgroup, as the dirac measure of a normal subgroup is an IRS. Since normal subgroups of the free groups correspond to all groups by taking quotients, IRS's of a free group generalize the notion of a group. The notion of a co-sofic IRS is the generalization of a sofic group in this framework, see Proposition 2.6.

As discussed before, a harder problem than finding a non-sofic group is finding a non-hyperlinear group. So it is natural to try to do this for IRS's. We will generalize the notion of hyperlinearity to IRS's of the free group. We will do this by defining for each IRS H of a group  $\Gamma$ , a von Neumann algebra  $L(\Gamma/H)$  generalizing the notion of quotienting against a normal subgroup. It is then natural to call an IRS H of a free group co-hyperlinear if  $L(\Gamma/H)$  is Connes embeddable. We prove:

**Theorem 1.2.** There is some free group with a non co-hyperlinear invariant random subgroup.

In particular, each  $L(\Gamma/H)$  is a subalgebra of  $L(\mathcal{R})$  (see discussion after Definition 2.12) for some countable Borel equivalence relation  $\mathcal{R}$ . This will allow us to recover Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 1.2

Our reduction from Connes embeddability of  $L(\Gamma/H)$  to non-local games will also be much more direct than in [Bow+24]. They used a different type of game first, the subgroup tests, and then reduced the subgroup tests to non-local games. We skip the subgroup tests entirely, essentially skipping most of [Bow+24] as our reduction reproves their results. We will also reduce to an easier decision problem a priori: they needed a restricted class of games called tailored games to have uncomputable permutation value. We do not need this restriction due to our methods.

Recall a non-local game is a combinatorial game, where there is a verifier and 2 players (See section 3). The idea is traces on certain  $C^*$  algebras will correspond to strategies in non-local games. This is how the full Connes embedding problem reduces to separating sets of strategies in non-local games. It turns out an IRS on a group  $\Gamma$  corresponds to a trace on its full  $C^*$  algebra  $C^*(\Gamma)$ , and so we can find strategies of non-local games corresponding to these traces.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Michael Brannan for discussions, supervision and very thoroughly proofreading this paper. I would also like to thank Michael Chapman for discussion, proofreading and providing suggestions to significantly clean up proof of Theorem 3.13. I would like to thank Stefan Frunza for pointing out the explicit GNS construction in Proposition 2.11. I would also like to thank Jesse Peterson for pointing out the proof of Lemma 2.18.

# 2 Invariant Random Subgroups

This subsection will set up the terminology we use for invariant random subgroups. Most of these are standard definitions, compare with [Bow+24].

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete group. Let  $\mathfrak{sub}(\Gamma)$  denote the space of subgroups of  $\Gamma$  topologized as a subset of  $\{0,1\}^{\Gamma}$ . Define a **Random subgroup** as a borel probability measure on  $\mathfrak{sub}(\Gamma)$ . Further, if the measure is invariant under the conjugation action of  $\Gamma$  on  $\mathfrak{sub}(\Gamma)$  then we call it an **Invariant Random Subgroup(IRS)**. We will denote by  $\operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$  the convex set of IRS's on  $\Gamma$ . Note that  $\mathfrak{sub}(\Gamma)$  is compact, so we can talk about the weak<sup>\*</sup> topology on  $\operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$ . The topology on  $\mathfrak{sub}(\Gamma)$  can be understood as follows: a net of subgroups  $H_{\lambda}$  converges to H means

$$g \in H \iff g \in H_{\lambda}$$
 eventually.

The topology on  $\operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$  can be understood as follows: a net  $\mu_{\lambda}$  converges to  $\mu$  if for each continuous  $f : \mathfrak{sub}(\Gamma) \to \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\int f d\mu_{\lambda} \to \int f d\mu.$$

Note in particular this is compact by the Banach-Alaoglu theorem.

Here are some examples of IRS:

**Example 2.2.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete group. Let  $N \subset \Gamma$  be a normal subgroup, then the point mass  $\delta_N$  is an IRS.

So we should think of an IRS as a generalization of a normal subgroup of  $\Gamma$ . We will only really care about IRS's of free groups, and since normal subgroups of free groups correspond to all finitely generated groups by looking at the quotients: we will consider these IRS as a generalization of the notion of a group by some generalized notion of a quotient (see Definition 2.10).

**Example 2.3.** Let  $(X, \mu)$  be a probability space, and  $\alpha : \Gamma \to \operatorname{Aut}(X, \mu)$  be a probability measure preserving (p.m.p.) action. Then we can describe an IRS as follows: first sample a  $x \in X$  according to  $\mu$ , and then look at

$$\operatorname{Stab}(x) = \{g \in \Gamma : gx = x\}.$$

We will call the induced probability measure on  $\mathfrak{sub}(\Gamma)$  by  $\operatorname{Stab}(\alpha)$ . Formally if we look at the map  $\operatorname{Stab} : X \to \mathfrak{sub}(\Gamma)$  sending a point to its stabilizer,  $\operatorname{Stab}(\alpha)$ is the pushforward of  $\mu$  under this map.

Note that the action  $\alpha$  being probability measure preserving gives conjugation invariance of the Stab( $\alpha$ ).

A remarkable result is that all IRS's are of this form:

**Theorem 2.4.** [AGV14, Proposition 14] Let  $\Gamma$  be a countable discrete group, and  $H \in IRS(\Gamma)$ . Then there is a p.m.p. action  $\alpha$  of  $\Gamma$  on some compact space X with borel probability measure  $\mu$  such that  $H = Stab(\alpha)$ . If H was ergodic, then  $\alpha$  can be picked to be ergodic.

We can now define:

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete group, and  $\alpha$  a p.m.p. action of it on a finite set. Then the IRS Stab( $\alpha$ ) will be called **finitely described**. A weak<sup>\*</sup> limit of finitely described IRS's will be called co-sofic.

The name is motivated by:

**Proposition 2.6.** [AGN17, lemma 16] Let  $\Gamma$  be a free group, and N a normal subgroup. Then  $\delta_N$  is co-sofic as an IRS  $\iff \Gamma/N$  is sofic as a group.

So if we think of IRS's of free groups as an extension of the notion of a group, we should think of co-sofic IRS's of the free group as an extension of the notion of a sofic group. One of the biggest open problems in this area is: Is every group sofic? What was proven in [Bow+24] is:

**Theorem 2.7.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a non-abelian free group. Then there is a non co-sofic IRS on it.

This of course does not prove the existence of non-sofic groups: indeed this non co-sofic IRS doesn't have to be a point-mass.

A slightly harder problem than finding a non-sofic group is finding a non hyperlinear group. The rest of the paper is dedicated to setting up what cohyperlinearity should mean for IRS's and proving there is a non co-hyperlinear IRS.

### 2.1 The algebra of an IRS

We will formalize the notion of quotienting against an IRS in this section. The idea is to go through traces on the universal group  $C^*$  algebra  $C^*(\Gamma)$  of  $\Gamma$ :

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete group, and  $H \in \operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$ . Then one can define a trace  $\tau_H$  on  $C^*(\Gamma)$  by:

$$\tau_H(g) := \mathbb{P}(g \in H).$$

Note that invariance gives  $\tau_H$  conjugation invariance, but one still needs to check positivity. We get this from Proposition 2.11. If  $H = \text{Stab}(\alpha)$  where  $\alpha$  is a p.m.p. action of  $\Gamma$  on some Borel probability space  $(X, \mu)$ , then

$$\tau_H(g) = \mu(x : gx = x).$$

In group theory these objects are called characters of  $\Gamma$  (positive definite conjugation invariant functions). Naimark's dialation theorem gives this equivalence, see [Pau03, theorem 4.8] for exposition.

Denote the trace complex of  $\Gamma$  by  $T(\Gamma)$ , and equip it with the weak<sup>\*</sup> topology. This is the topology of pointwise convergence on  $C^*(\Gamma)$ , which is the same as pointwise convergence when restricted to  $\Gamma$ . Then note there is an affine map  $\operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma) \to T(\Gamma)$  given by  $\operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma) \ni H \mapsto \tau_H \in T(\Gamma)$ . This map is neither injective nor surjective generally.

Not being surjective is clear as a trace  $\tau \in T(\Gamma)$  can be negative on a group element, which is not the case for  $\tau_H$  for  $H \in \operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$ . For non-injectivity consider  $S_3$ , which has 4 conjugacy classes of subgroups but  $T(S_3)$  has 3 irreducible characters. An IRS on a finite group is simply a probability measure on the set of conjugacy class of subgroups, while a character on a finite group is in the convex hull of the irreducible characters. So a dimension argument forces this map to not be injective. This map is however  $w^* - w^*$  continuous, as  $\{H : g \in H\}$  is a clopen set making its indicator continuous. So the image of this, call it  $T_{IRS}(\Gamma)$ , is compact.

One of the main themes in this paper will be looking at the von Neumann algebra that corresponds to a trace. This is done by looking at the Gelfand-Naimark-Segal(GNS) representation of a trace.

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra and  $\tau$  a trace on it, then the GNS representation of  $\tau$ is a representation  $\pi_{\tau} : \mathcal{A} \to B(H_{\tau})$  and a vector  $\xi \in H_{\tau}$  with  $\tau(a) = \langle \xi | \pi(a) | \xi \rangle$ . The von Neumann algebra of  $\tau$  will be  $\pi_{\tau}(\mathcal{A})'' \subset B(H_{\tau})$ , and note that  $\tau$  extends to this algebra by

$$\tilde{\tau}(a) = \langle \xi | \pi(a) | \xi \rangle \quad a \in \pi_{\tau}(\mathcal{A})''.$$

This algebra is well defined due to uniqueness of GNS: any two cyclic representation inducing  $\tau$  will be unitarily equivalent. We will denote this von Neumann algebra as  $\tau(\mathcal{A})''$ . If  $\mathcal{A} = C^*(\Gamma)$ , we will denote this as  $\tau(\Gamma)''$ . It will be implicit that we are considering this von Neumann algebra with the extension of  $\tau$  as its trace.

Consider the left regular representation  $\lambda : \Gamma \to U(\ell^2(\Gamma))$ , where  $(\lambda(g)f)(h) = f(g^{-1}h)$  for  $g, h \in \Gamma$ . Then we define the group von Neumann algebra to be  $\lambda(\Gamma)'' \subset B(\ell^2(\Gamma))$ . We consider it with the trace  $\tau(g) = 1$  if g = e and 0 otherwise on group elements.

Before defining our IRS algebras, let us make one observation:

**Proposition 2.9.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete group and N a normal subgroup. If  $\tau_N$  is the trace on  $\Gamma$  corresponding to the point mass  $\delta_N \in \text{IRS}(\Gamma)$ , then

$$\tau_N(\Gamma)'' = L(\Gamma/N)$$

where  $L(\Gamma/N)$  is the group von Neumann algebra of  $\Gamma/N$  with its standard trace.

*Proof.* First note that  $\tau_N(g) = 1$  if  $g \in N$  and 0 otherwise. Now take the representation:

$$\pi: \Gamma \to U(\ell^2(\Gamma/N))$$

where  $(\pi(g)f)([h]) = f([g^{-1}h])$  for  $g \in \Gamma, [h] \in \Gamma/N$ . Note that all elements of N act trivially, so this is actually a homomorphism  $\tilde{\pi} : \Gamma/N \to U(\ell^2(\Gamma/N))$ . Note

this is just the left regular representation of  $\Gamma/N$ .

Fix the vector  $\xi \in \ell^2(\Gamma/N)$  that is 1 on the identity coset and 0 everywhere else. Then it is clear

$$\tau_N(g) = \langle \xi | \pi(g) | \xi \rangle$$

So the corresponding algebra is  $\pi(\Gamma)'' = \tilde{\pi}(\Gamma/N)''$  and by definition this is the group von Neumann algebra  $L(\Gamma/N)$ . Note that the extension of the trace is 1 on elements of N and 0 on every other group element, i.e the standard trace on the group von Neumann algebra.

Based on this, we can now define the quotient of a group by an IRS:

**Definition 2.10.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete group and  $H \in IRS(\Gamma)$ . Then define the *quotient of*  $\Gamma$  by H as the tracial von Neumann algebra:

$$L(\Gamma/H) := \tau_H(\Gamma)''.$$

A natural question now is this: can we write the GNS representation of  $\tau_H$  explicitly? The answer is yes.

To see this, let  $H \in \operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$  correspond to the p.m.p. action  $\alpha$  of  $\Gamma$  on some  $(x, \mu)$ . Let  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha} \subset X \times X$  be the relation defined by the orbits, i.e.  $x \equiv gx$ . Let  $\pi_0 : \mathcal{R}_{\alpha} \to X$  be given by  $(x, y) \mapsto x$  and let  $\Gamma$  act on  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}$  on the first coordinate, i.e. g(x, y) = (gx, y). Define

$$\nu(E) := \int |\pi_0^{-1}(x) \cap E| d\mu(x).$$

This is a  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}$  [AP, section 1.5].

**Proposition 2.11.** [Ver10, Theorem 9] Let H be an IRS of  $\Gamma$ . Suppose it corresponds to p.m.p. action  $\alpha$  of  $\Gamma$  on  $(X, \mu)$ , i.e.  $H = \text{Stab}(\alpha)$ . Let  $\pi : \Gamma \to U(L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}, \nu))$  correspond to the action described above. Let  $\Delta \subset \mathcal{R}_{\alpha}$  be the diagonal of X. Then

$$\tau_H(g) = \langle 1_\Delta | \pi(g) | 1_\Delta \rangle.$$

In particular, the algebra  $L(\Gamma/H) = \pi(\Gamma)''$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\pi(g)1_{\Delta}$  is the characteristic function on  $g^{-1}\Delta = \{(g^{-1}x, x) :$ 

 $x \in X$ . So

$$\begin{split} \langle 1_{\Delta} | \pi(g) | 1_{\Delta} \rangle &= \int_{\mathcal{R}} 1_{\Delta} 1_{g^{-1}\Delta} d\nu \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{R}} 1_{\{(x,x):x=gx\}} d\nu \\ &= \nu\{(x,x):x=gx\} \\ &= \int_{X} |\pi_0^{-1}(x) \cap \{(x,x):x=gx\} | d\mu \\ &= \int_{X} 1_{x=gx} d\mu \\ &= \mu(x:gx=x). \end{split}$$

This can be extended to a larger algebra:

**Definition 2.12.** Let  $\alpha$  be a p.m.p. action of  $\Gamma$  on  $(X, \mu)$ , and let  $(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}, \nu)$  be as in proposition 2.11. For  $f \in L^{\infty}(X, \mu)$  define  $M_f \in B(L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}, \nu))$  as

$$(M_f\xi)(x,y) = f(x)\xi(x,y).$$

Then the von Neumann algebra generated by  $\pi(\Gamma)$  and  $\{M_f : f \in L^{\infty}(X, \mu)\}$  is defined to be von Neumann algebra  $L(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha})$  of the relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}$ . We consider this with the trace

$$\tau_{\alpha}(a) = \langle 1_{\Delta} | a | 1_{\Delta} \rangle, \quad a \in L(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha})$$

This can be defined for any measurable relation on a Borel space, but essentially reduces to this case. These algebras are useful as the inclusion  $L^{\infty}(X) \subset L(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha})$  is a complete invariant for the action  $\alpha$  (up to orbit equivalence). These are also canonical examples of Cartan Inclusions. Note in particular  $L(\Gamma/\operatorname{Stab}(\alpha)) \subset L(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha})$ . Also note that if  $\alpha$  is ergodic then  $L(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha})$  is a  $II_1$  factor. See [AP, section 1.5, 12.1] for a discussion of all of these.

### 2.2 Co-hyperlinear IRS

Now that we can talk about IRS's algebraicly, it is easy to define co-hyperlinearity for it. Recall that a group  $\Gamma$  is called hyperlinear if its von Neumann algebra  $L(\Gamma)$ is Connes embeddable, i.e there is a trace preserving embedding  $L(\Gamma) \hookrightarrow R^{\omega}$  of the group algebra into an ultrapower of the hyperfinite  $II_1$  factor. So we want cohyperlinearity of a  $H \in IRS(\Gamma)$  to line up with Connes embeddebility of  $L(\Gamma/H)$ .

A crucial point for us is that a tracial von Neumann algebra being Connes embeddable is something we can express in terms of traces:

**Definition 2.13.** A trace  $\tau$  on a  $C^*$  algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  is called amenable if there are contractively completely positive (c.c.p) maps  $\phi_n : \mathcal{A} \to M_{k_n}(\mathbb{C})$  with

 $\|\phi_n(ab) - \phi_n(a)\phi_n(b)\|_2 \to 0 \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ 

so that  $\tau(a) = \lim \operatorname{tr}_{k_n} \circ \phi_n(a)$ . Here  $||A||_2 = \operatorname{tr}_n(A^*A)$  is the normalized Hilbert-Schmidt norm.

This is a finite dimensional approximation property for the trace, and it turns out the corresponding finite dimensional approximation property for the algebra is Connes embeddibility:

**Proposition 2.14.** [Bro06] Let  $\Gamma$  be a free group, and  $\tau$  a trace on it. The following are equivalent:

- 1.  $\tau(\Gamma)''$  has a trace preserving embedding into  $R^{\omega}$
- 2.  $\tau$  is amenable.
- 3. There is a sequence of finite dimensional representations  $\pi_n : \Gamma \to U_n(\mathbb{C})$ with  $\tau$  being the weak<sup>\*</sup> limit of  $\operatorname{tr}_n \circ \pi_n$ .
- 4. There is a sequence of traces  $\tau_n$  with finite dimensional GNS representation whose weak<sup>\*</sup> limit is  $\tau$ .

Here  $R^{\omega}$  is an ultrapower of the hyperfinite II<sub>1</sub> factor.

Let us call the collection of traces with finite dimensional GNS represention the finite dimensional traces of  $\Gamma$ , and denote this set by  $T_{f.d}(\Gamma) \subset T(\Gamma)$ .

Note the above proposition is not true for a general  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ . In general amenability means  $\tau(A)''$  has an embedding into  $R^{\omega}$  with a completely positive lift onto  $\prod_{\mathbb{N}} R$ . But the free group  $C^*$  algebras have the local lifting property, which allow us to deduce that  $1 \iff 2$  in that case. See [BO, section 13.1] for a detailed discussion of the local lifting property. We will use this property in our proof of Theorem 3.5 in a minor way.

Actually free groups satisfy something stronger, Hilbert Schmidt stability. This allows the UCP lift of the embedding of  $\tau(A)'' \hookrightarrow R^{\omega}$  to actually be a \*-homomorphism. This is how 1 implies 3 for free groups.

We also remark that while the traces are called amenable, the corresponding algebras are not amenable von Neumann algebras. For that, one would need to restrict to a class of traces called uniformly amenable traces.

Of course one of the nice things about the free group is that it is an universal object. It turns out every tracial von Neumann algebra arises from a trace on some free group (the extreme points correspond to factors). So the fact that there is a non-Connes embeddable von Neumann algebra can be stated as: **Proposition 2.15.** There is a non-amenable trace on each non-abelian free group. That is if  $\Gamma$  is free then  $T(\Gamma) \neq \overline{T_{f,d_*}(\Gamma)}^{w^*}$ .

See [Bro06, Proposition 6.3.5] for more details.

Now it is clear how to generalize the notion of hyperlinearity to IRS's:

**Definition 2.16.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete group, and  $H \in \text{IRS}(\Gamma)$ . Then call H co-hyperlinear if the corresponding trace  $\tau_H$  is amenable.

**Proposition 2.17.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a free group, and  $H \in IRS(\Gamma)$ . Then

1. H is co-hyperlinear  $\iff L(\Gamma/H)$  is Connes embeddable

2.  $H = \delta_N$  is co-hyperlinear  $\iff \Gamma/N$  is hyperlinear as a group.

Let us make explicit what the difference between co-hyperlinear and co-sofic is:

**Lemma 2.18.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete group and  $H \in IRS(\Gamma)$  be ergodic.

Then H being finitely described implies  $\tau_H$  is a finite dimensional trace.

Further if  $\Gamma$  is finitely generated, then  $\tau_H$  being a finite dimensional trace implies H is finitely described.

*Proof.* ( $\implies$ ) Let  $H = \text{Stab}(\alpha)$  where  $\alpha$  is the action of  $\Gamma$  on a finite set with the uniform measure. Then the orbit relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha} \subset X \times X$  is also a finite set and hence by proposition 2.11 there is a finite dimensional representation  $\pi : \Gamma \to U(L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}))$  inducing  $\tau_H$ .

 $(\Leftarrow)$  We can find an ergodic action  $\alpha$  of  $\Gamma$  on some probability space  $(X, \mu)$  with  $H = \text{Stab}(\alpha)$ .

Let  $F_n \subset X$  denote the set of points with orbits of size less than n. Note that a point having orbit of size n is the same as the stabilizer K having index n. Since the action  $\Gamma$  on  $\Gamma/K$  uniquely determines K (by looking at the stabilizer of the identity coset), the corresponding homomorphism  $\Gamma \to \text{Sym}(n)$  uniquely determines K. In particular, since  $\Gamma$  is finitely generated, there are finitely many subgroups of index n of  $\Gamma$ . So:

$$F_n = \bigcup_{K: |\Gamma/K| \le n} \{ x : gx = x \forall g \in K \}.$$

This is a finite union of measurable sets, and hence measurable.  $F_n$  is  $\Gamma$  invariant and hence has measure 0 or 1. If it has measure 1, then H is supported on subgroups of index  $\leq n$ , and this is a finite set, call it Supp(H). Now ergodicity of H forces Supp(H) to be the set of conjugates of a given subgroup K', and this is the IRS induced by the action of  $\Gamma$  on the finite set of cosets  $\Gamma/K'$ . If all  $F_n$  have measure 0, then the action has infinite orbits almost everywhere. By [PT14, Proposition 3.1], the representation  $\Gamma \to U(L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}, \nu))$  is weakly mixing, i.e it has no finite dimensional sub-representations. In particular,  $\tau_H$  cannot be finite dimensional, ruling this case out.

This immediately gives us:

**Proposition 2.19.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a countable discrete group and  $H \in \operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$  be co-sofic. Then H is co-hyperlinear

Proof. Let H be co-sofic, then there is a sequence of finitely described IRS  $(H_n)$  with  $H_n \to H$ . Since the map sending an IRS to its trace is  $w^* - w^*$  continuous, we have  $\tau_{H_n} \to \tau_H$ . By Lemma 2.18 we get that each  $\tau_{H_n}$  is finite dimensional, and so  $\tau_H$  is a  $w^*$  limit of finite dimensional traces. This means  $\tau_H$  is amenable.  $\Box$ 

Let  $\Gamma$  be a free group. Note that showing a seperation between co-sofic IRS's and all IRS's is implied by showing a seperation between  $T_{IRS}(\Gamma)$  and  $\overline{T_{IRS}(\Gamma)} \cap T_{f.d.}(\Gamma)$ . On the other hand, showing seperation between co-hyperlinear IRS's and all IRS's is showing a seperation between  $T_{IRS}(\Gamma)$  and  $T_{IRS}(\Gamma) \cap \overline{T_{f.d.}(\Gamma)}$ . The latter is an a priori harder problem as one might be able to approximate a IRS trace with finite dimensional traces, but not finite dimensional traces arising from IRS's. Actually these notions agreeing would imply hyperlinearity and soficity agree for groups, by specializing to dirac measures.

We also remark that if  $\operatorname{IRS}_{cohyp}(\Gamma)$  denotes the set of co-hyperlinear IRS's of free group  $\Gamma$ , it is a  $w^*$  closed convex subset of  $\operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$  containing the co-sofic IRS's. This is because it is the pre-image of  $T_{IRS}(\Gamma) \cap \overline{T_{f.d.}(\Gamma)}$  under the affine continuous  $H \mapsto \tau_H$ 

## 3 Non-Local Games

To each trace on a certain group  $C^*$  algebra to be defined below, one can associate a strategy on non-local games. Since we have associated to each IRS a trace, we can associate to each IRS a strategy for some non-local game. See [Gol21, section 4, 5] for a less bare bones discussion of the topic.

**Definition 3.1.** A non-local game  $\mathfrak{G}$  has the following parameters: a question set Q, a probability distribution q on  $Q \times Q$ , an integer m describing the length of the answer, and a decider function  $D : (\{0,1\}^m)^2 \times Q^2 \to \{0,1\}$ . We will write this as D(a, b|x, y) for  $a, b \in \{0,1\}^m$  and  $x, y \in Q$ .

We will also associate to this game a set

$$S(\mathfrak{G}) = \{u_{x,i} : x \in Q, 1 \le i \le m\}$$

each  $u_{x,i}$  is to be regarded as a formal variable which encodes the value of the *i*th bit in the answer a corresponding to question x. We will simply write S when there is no chance for confusion. We will write  $S_x$  for the variables corresponding to question x.

One should think of this as an interactive proof system: There are two players Alice and Bob, and a verifier. The verifier samples a pair of questions (x, y)according to q from  $Q \times Q$ , then sends x to Alice and y to Bob. Alice and Bob then both send m bit answers a and b to the verifier, respectively. The verifier evaluates D(a, b|x, y) and Alice and Bob win when this is 1.

We are using the notation of [BCV24] here, specifically with regards to the variable set. A general game can have different question sets for Alice and Bob, and different answer sets for them too. However we will not need that level of generality.

### 3.1 Strategies

Note that the only thing Alice and Bob can do is when asked questions  $(x, y) \in Q^2$ , give answers  $(a, b) \in (\{0, 1\}^m)^2$ . So a strategy for Alice and Bob will be some conditional distribution  $(p(a, b|x, y))_{(\{0, 1\}^m)^2 \times Q^2}$ . We will call these **correlations**. The idea is in these games, Alice and Bob can discuss a strategy before hand but cannot communicate during the game. So Alice has no idea what question Bob got and vice versa. So strategies where Alice's answer is independent of Bob's answer would be a classical strategy.

However, if Alice and Bob share quantum entanglement, then there can be correlation between their choices of their answer. Precisely:

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\mathfrak{G}$  be a non-local game. A quantum strategy is a map  $\rho: S(\mathfrak{G}) \to U_n(\mathbb{C})$  for some n with:

- 1.  $\rho(u)^2 = 1$  for each  $u \in S$
- 2.  $\rho(u)$  and  $\rho(v)$  commute whenever  $u, v \in S_x$ , i.e different bits corresponding to the same answer should commute.

Define

$$e_x^a = \prod_{i \le m} \frac{1 + (-1)^{a_i} \rho(u_{x,i})}{2}$$

This is the product of the spectral projections of each bit onto  $(-1)^{a_i}$ . Then the corresponding correlation is defined as:

$$p(a,b|x,y) = \operatorname{tr}_n(e_x^a e_y^b).$$

A quantum approximate correlation is a pointwise limit of quantum correlations.

The value of a game  $\mathfrak{G}$  on strategy  $\rho$ ,  $\operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G}, \rho)$ , is just the expected value of winning if Alice and Bob answer (a, b) on questions (x, y) with probability p(a, b|x, y). We define the **quantum value** of the game as:

$$\omega^*(\mathfrak{G}) := \sup_{\rho} \operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G}, \rho)$$

the best probability of winning with a quantum strategy.

Actually in literature these are called synchronous quantum approximate strategies, but we will not consider any non-synchronous strategies so we omit that word. This is also defined slightly differently than standard literature, but Theorem 3.3 shows the equivalence. Note that if the dimension was 1, this would just be a classical correlation, since we would have p(a, b|x, y) = p(a|x)p(b|y).

There are two perspectives, one of them is we can associate to each bit of the answer a formal variable, to be interpreted as matrices. This is what we are doing. In this case, the spectral projections of these variables correspond to what bit that variable outputs. On the other hand, one can associate a variable  $v_x$  to each question  $x \in Q$  with  $v_x^{2^m} = 1$ . So now  $v_x$  will have  $2^m$  spectral projections, and they will correspond to the  $2^m$  different outputs on question x. These perspectives are equivalent:

Let  $\mathfrak{G}$  be a non-local game with question set Q, answers of size m, and variable set S. By  $\mathcal{F}(S,2)$  we denote the group generated by elements of S with the condition they have order 2. By  $*_Q \mathbb{Z}_2^m$  we will denote the quotient of  $\mathcal{F}(S,2)$  by  $\{[u_{x,i}, u_{x,j}] : x \in X, i, j \leq m\}$ . That is, we are imposing the condition that the variables corresponding to the same question commute. Let  $U_{x,i}$  denote the group unitaries corresponding to  $u_{x,i}$  in  $C^*(*_Q \mathbb{Z}_2^m)$ , and  $e_x^a$  the spectral projections as above for  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_2^m$ . That is:

$$e_x^a = \prod_{i \le m} \frac{1 + (-1)^{a_i} U_{x,i}}{2}$$

Note that these projections generate the algebra and have no relation between each other except  $e_x^a e_x^b = \delta_{ab}$  and  $\sum_a e_x^a = 1$ . Hence we can find an isomorphism  $C^*(*_Q \mathbb{Z}_2^m) \cong C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q, 2^m))$  by looking at the  $2^m$  spectral projections of the defining unitaries in the latter. In particular, this algebra has the local lifting property (See [ES24, Corollary 4.6]).

**Theorem 3.3.** [KPS18, Theorem 3.6] Let  $\mathfrak{G}$  be a non-local game with question set Q and answers of size m. Then p is a quantum approximate correlation iff

there is an amenable trace  $\tau$  on  $C^*(*_Q \mathbb{Z}_2^m) \cong C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q, 2^m))$  so that

$$p(a,b|x,y) = \tau(e_x^a e_y^b).$$

If we remove the restriction to amenable traces and allow any trace, then the resulting class of correlations are called quantum commuting. The idea of MIP\*=RE was separating the quantum commuting value and quantum value of some game, and that would give a non-amenable trace on this group.

Of course, we do not want just any old trace to induce our correlations, but specifically the ones coming from IRS's. So let us define:

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $\mathfrak{G}$  be a non-local game with question set Q and answers of size m. An **IRS strategy** is defined by the following data: a map  $\sigma : S \cup \{J\} \rightarrow \operatorname{Aut}(X,\mu)$  where  $(X,\mu)$  is a Borel probability space. We will require (equality here means they agree  $\mu$ -almost everywhere):

- $\mu(x:\sigma(J)x = x) = 0 \text{ and } \sigma(J)^2 = 1.$
- For  $u \in \sigma(S)$ , we have  $u^2 = 1$  and uJ = Ju.
- For  $u, v \in \sigma(S_x)$  we have uv = vu.

If  $\mu$  was the uniform measure on a finite set, call this a **permutation strategy**.

Note that  $\sigma$  extends to a homomorphism  $\tilde{\sigma} : *_Q \mathbb{Z}_2^m \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \to \operatorname{Aut}(X, \mu)$ . That is, it is a p.m.p. action of the group  $\mathbb{Z}_2^m \times \mathbb{Z}_2$  on  $(X, \mu)$ . So we can consider the IRS Stab $(\tilde{\sigma})$  and then the corresponding trace  $\tau$  on  $C^*(*_Q \mathbb{Z}_2^m \times \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong$  $C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q, 2^m)) \otimes C^*(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  has

$$\tau(g) = \mu(x : gx = x).$$

So we can define the correlation:

$$p(a,b|x,y) = \tau((1-J)e_x^a e_y^b).$$

Note that this is positive as  $\tau((1-J)a) = \frac{1}{2}\tau((1-J)a(1-J))$  and these sum up to 1 as  $\tau(J) = 0$ . We will define  $\omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G})$  to be the best winning probability over all IRS strategies.

We remark that this definition agrees with that of [Bow+24] for permutation strategies. They defined permutation strategies as maps  $\sigma : S \cup \{J\} \to \text{Sym}(2n)$ with the same conditions, and if  $W^-$  is the negative eigenspace of the image of J in U(2n), then they defined the correlation as

$$p(a,b|x,y) = \operatorname{tr}_n(e_x^a e_y^b|_{W^-}).$$

Since  $\frac{1-J}{2}$  is the projection onto  $W^-$ , this is the same correlation as our definition. This is why we had to add this (1-J) to our construction, as without it we would not be able to use the result of [BCV24].

Now if we had a game with a IRS strategy that is not quantum approximate, then intuitively that should arise from an IRS trace that is not amenable, which is what we want. Formally:

**Theorem 3.5.** Suppose there is a game  $\mathfrak{G}$  with

$$\omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G}) > \omega^*(\mathfrak{G}).$$

Then there is a non co-hyperlinear IRS on some free group.

Proof. Let  $\mathfrak{G}$  be a game with  $\omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G}) > \omega^*(\mathfrak{G})$ . Let  $\sigma : S \cup \{J\} \to \operatorname{Aut}(X,\mu)$ be a IRS strategy with  $\operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G},\sigma) > \omega^*(\mathfrak{G})$ . Let  $\tau$  be the corresponding trace on  $C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q,2^m)) \otimes C^*(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  so that

$$p(a,b|x,y) = \tau((1-J)e_x^a e_y^b)$$

is the correlation.

Note that there is a natural inclusion  $C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q, 2^m)) \subset C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q, 2^m)) \otimes C^*(\mathbb{Z}_2)$ induced by the natural group inclusion. Note that  $a \mapsto \tau((1-J)a)$  for  $a \in C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q, 2^m)) \otimes C^*(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  is a trace as J commutes with everything. Call this trace  $\tau'$ . Then  $\tau'|_{C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q, 2^m))}$  is also a trace, and has

$$p(a,b|x,y) = \tau'|_{C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q,2^m))}(e_x^a e_y^b).$$

Since p is not a quantum approximate correlation,  $\tau'|_{C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q,2^m))}$  is not an amenable trace. Since amenability of traces is preserved under restriction [BO, proposition 6.3.5], we get  $\tau'$  itself is not amenable. Now we have

$$\tau(a) = \frac{1}{2}\tau((1-J)a) + \frac{1}{2}\tau(Ja)$$

and both are traces, and since the amenable traces are a face [BO, proposition 6.3.7], we have  $\tau$  is not amenable.

Note that  $C^*(*_Q \mathbb{Z}_2^m \times \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong C^*(\mathcal{F}(Q, 2^m)) \otimes C^*(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  has the local lifting property [BO, exercise 13.2]. Note there is a natural quotient map  $q : \mathcal{F}(S \cup \{J\}) \to *_Q \mathbb{Z}_2^m \times \mathbb{Z}_2$  and it induces a quotient on the  $C^*$  level. So we can lift up  $\tau$  to  $\tilde{\tau} = \tau \circ q$  on  $C^*(\mathcal{F}(S \cup \{J\}))$ . Note  $\tilde{\tau}$  corresponds to an action of  $\mathcal{F}(S \cup \{J\})$ on  $(X, \mu)$ , so it is an IRS trace. We also have

$$\tilde{\tau}(\mathcal{F}(S \cup \{J\}))'' = \tau \left( \underset{Q}{\ast} \mathbb{Z}_2^m \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \right)''.$$

Since the latter has the local lifting property, the non-amenability of  $\tau$  implies the algebra is not Connes embeddable, and hence that  $\tilde{\tau}$  is not amenable.

Since this implies the negation to Aldous-Lyons by Proposition 2.19, this proof essentially allows us to skip most of [Bow+24]. That is, we reduce to non-local games without having to go through subgroup tests. In that paper, they also reduced to the a priori harder problem of finding this separation for a restricted class of games called tailored games, which have a sort of linearization baked into them allowing translation as group like objects. However we do not require this, as these IRS strategies already bake in a group like structure.

This highlights two different approaches when one wants to use these nonlocal games: restrict the class of strategy or restrict the class of games. [Bow+24] ended up doing both but their ideas were based off of the latter. If one restricts to linear constraint games, then showing  $\omega^*$  is uncomputable on this class of game would imply the existence of a non-hyperlinear group, and the tailored games of [Bow+24] were "semi-linear".

We also remark that one of the things that made the proof of Theorem 3.5 clean was that we are separating IRS traces from amenable traces. Being an amenable trace is a property of the group  $C^*$  algebra that does not rely on the underlying group, so we could use the local lifting property to get very clean arguments. If we tried to separate IRS traces from those that arise from co-sofic IRS's (a weaker problem), we could not do things so cleanly. This is because being a co-sofic IRS trace is something that relies on the underlying group, and we would have to start using some group stability results.

### 3.2 NPA hierarchy

To get the separation, we will need an analogue of the NPA hierarchy for these IRS strategies. That is:

**Theorem 3.6.** Let  $\mathfrak{G}$  be a non-local game, then there is a computably enumerable sequence  $\alpha_n$  that is monotonically decreasing and converges to  $\omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G})$ .

Recall this means there is a Turing machine which takes as input the description of some non local game, and enumerates the sequence  $\alpha_n$ .

To see this we will recall some notions from [Bow+24, section 2]. Throughout this section, fix a non-local game  $\mathfrak{G}$  and its variable set S. Then let  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(S \cup \{J\})$ .

**Definition 3.7.** Let  $B \subset C \subset \mathcal{F}$ . Then define the restriction map  $R_{B \subset C}$ :  $\{0,1\}^C \to \{0,1\}^B$  as the map that sends  $A \subset C$  to  $A \cap B \subset B$ . If  $C = \mathcal{F}$ , then call this map  $R_B$ .

**Definition 3.8.** A pseudo subgroup of  $B \subset \mathcal{F}$  is a subset  $A \subset B$  which is the restriction of some subgroup. That is, there is some subgroup  $H \subset \mathcal{F}$  so that  $A = R_B(H) = H \cap B$ .

**Definition 3.9.** A random pseudo-subgroup of  $B \subset \mathcal{F}$  is a probability measure  $\pi$  on  $\{0,1\}^B$  supported on the pseudo-subgroups of B.

A random pseudo-subgroup  $\pi$  is in addition invariant if for each  $K, L \subset B$  so that  $sKs^{-1}, sLs^{-1} \subset B$  for each  $s \in S \cup S^{-1}$ , we have

$$\pi\{A \subset B : K \subset A, \ A \cap L = \varnothing\} = \pi\{A \subset B : sKs^{-1} \subset A, \ A \cap sLs^{-1} = \varnothing\}$$

Call the set of Invariant random pseudo-subgroups of B as  $Q_B$ , and let  $\tilde{Q}_B = R_{B*}^{-1}(Q_B)$ . That is, the set of measures on  $\{0,1\}^{\mathcal{F}}$  whose pushforward to  $\{0,1\}^{B}$  is an invariant random pseudo-subgroup.

For each  $\pi \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_B$ , we will extend the value of a non-local game to it. Here is the idea, if  $\sigma : S \cup \{J\} \to \operatorname{Aut}(X, \mu)$  is an IRS strategy, then it corresponds to an IRS  $H = \operatorname{Stab}(\sigma)$  on  $\mathcal{F}$ . Now the correlations with respect to this are

$$p(a,b|x,y) = \tau_H((1-J)e_x^a e_y^b), \quad e_x^a = \prod_{i \le m} \frac{1+(-1)^{a_i} U_{x,i}}{2}$$

In particular, each p(a, b|x, y) only requires the data of  $\tau$  on a finite number of group elements. One can see this by expanding out  $e_x^a$  and  $e_y^b$ . The only group elements appearing in this will be those that are a product of elements  $J, U_{x,i}, U_{y,i}$  of length  $\leq m + 1$ .

So we can find a finite set K with

$$p(a,b|x,y) = \sum_{g \in K} c_g^{abxy} \mathbb{P}(g \in H).$$

We can assume K contains  $S \cup \{J\}$ , all of the squares from  $S \cup \{J\}$  and all the commutators from it, simply by unioning this finite set with K.

Now for a probability distribution  $\pi$  on  $\{0,1\}^B$  for some set  $B \supset K$ , we can define  $\operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G},\pi)$  as the expected value of winning with correlation

$$p(a,b|x,y) = \sum_{g \in K} c_g^{abxy} \pi(A : g \in A).$$

Note this will typically not actually be a conditional probability distribution, as these can become negative. This is because  $\pi$  is not actually invariant and so we are not dealing with traces. But still we can find the value of the game on it. That is if q is the distribution on the question set  $Q \times Q$  and D is the decider,

then define

$$\operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G},\pi) = \sum_{x,y} \sum_{a,b} q(x,y) D(a,b|x,y) \bigg( \sum_{g \in K} c_g^{abxy} \pi(A:g \in A). \bigg).$$

Now we prove:

**Lemma 3.10.** Let  $K \subset B \subset C \subset \mathcal{F}$ , and let  $\pi$  be a probability measure on  $\{0,1\}^C$ . Then

$$\operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G},\pi) = \operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G}, R_{B \subset C*}\pi).$$

Proof. Note that

$$R_{B \subset C*}(\pi)(A \subset B : g \in A) = \pi(A \subset C : g \in R_{B \subset C}(A)) = \pi(A \subset C : g \in A)$$

for  $g \in K$ . Note we used that  $g \in B$  always. Since these determine the value of the game, we are done.

Only one thing is missing: not all IRS will define a strategy for our game. For example we want all members of S to square to identity in the action. But this is easy to enforce:

**Definition 3.11.** Let  $K \subset B \subset \mathcal{F}$ . Define the set  $\mathcal{T}_B$  to be the set of probability measures on  $\{0,1\}^B$  that has measure 1 on the following sets:

- 1.  $\{A : J \notin A\}$
- 2.  $\{A : [u, v] \in A \text{ for } u, v \in S_x\}$
- 3.  $\{A : u^2 \in A \quad u \in S \cup \{J\}\}$
- 4.  $\{A : [u, J] \in A \quad u \in S\}.$

Note  $R_{B \subset C*}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_B = \mathcal{T}_C$ .

The point of this is that  $\operatorname{IRS}(\mathcal{F}) \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$  correspond precisely to the IRS's which induce strategies on  $\mathfrak{G}$ . To see this take any IRS H of  $\mathcal{F}$ , and any action  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  on some Borel probability space  $(X, \mu)$  which has  $H = \operatorname{Stab}(\alpha)$ . Then having measure 1 on e.g.  $\{A : u^2 \in A \mid u \in S \cup \{J\}\}$  is simply saying  $u^2$  stabalizes almost all points of X, i.e  $u^2 = 1$ .

Now we can finally construct the NPA hierarchy (the proof follows the structure of [Bow+24, proof of theorem 1.10], with the appropriate modification for our setting): *Proof of Theorem 3.6.* Let K be as above and  $B \supset K$  be a finite set. Then we can define

$$\operatorname{Val}_B(\mathfrak{G}) = \sup(\operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G},\pi): \pi \in \mathcal{Q}_B \cap \mathcal{T}_B) = \sup(\operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G},\pi): \pi \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_B \cap \mathcal{T}_F).$$

Here we use that  $R_{B_*}^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_B) = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Let  $B_t$  be a sequence of sets,  $B_1 \supset K$  and  $B_{t+1} \supset B_t$ . Also suppose that  $\bigcup_t B_t = \mathcal{F}$ . Then we prove:

- Val<sub>B<sub>t</sub></sub>( $\mathfrak{G}$ ) is computable. To see this, first from [Bow+24, lemma 2.16],  $\mathcal{Q}_{B_t}$  can be considered as a computable polytope of  $\mathbb{R}^{\{0,1\}^{B_t}}$  (i.e assigning each subset of  $B_t$  a real number). This means  $\mathcal{Q}_{B_t}$  can be computably defined using integer linear equations and inequalities. Note that  $\mathcal{Q}_{B_t} \cap \mathcal{T}_{B_t}$  just adds finitely more linear equations to this: for fixed subsets of  $B_t$  we are asking the sum over subsets of those to add up to 1. Hence we can do a linear program over  $\mathcal{Q}_{B_t} \cap \mathcal{T}_{B_t}$  to compute Val<sub>B<sub>t</sub></sub>( $\mathfrak{G}$ ) in finite time.
- $\operatorname{Val}_{B_t}(\mathfrak{G}) \geq \operatorname{Val}_{B_{t+1}}(\mathfrak{G})$ . To see this, note that  $R_{B \subset C^*}(\mathcal{Q}_C) = \mathcal{Q}_B$ . So

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{B_t} \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}} \supset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{B_{t+1}} \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$$

giving the result

• Val<sub>B<sub>t</sub></sub>( $\mathfrak{G}$ )  $\rightarrow \omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G})$ . The  $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_B$  and  $\mathcal{T}_F$  are weak\* closed subsets of Prob( $\{0,1\}^F$ ) and hence their intersection is compact. So there is some  $\pi_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{B_t} \cap \mathcal{T}_F$ which has

$$\operatorname{Val}_{B_t}(\mathfrak{G}) = \operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G}, \pi_t).$$

We can pick a weak<sup>\*</sup> cluster of  $\pi_t$ , say  $\pi_\infty$ . By passing to a subsequence, we may assume  $\pi_t$  weak<sup>\*</sup> converge to  $\pi_\infty$ . Now note that for all  $s \ge t$ , we have  $\pi_s \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{B_t} \cap \mathcal{T}_S$ . Since this set is closed, we get  $\pi_\infty \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{B_t} \cap \mathcal{T}_F$  for all t. I.e

$$\pi_{\infty} \in \bigcap_{t} \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{B_{t}} \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathrm{IRS}(\mathcal{F}) \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$$

See [Bow+24], lemma 2.12 for the proof of this intersection.

This means  $\pi_{\infty}$  is a IRS strategy for the game. And now since  $\operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G}, -)$  is a continuous functional we get:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname{Val}_{B_t}(\mathfrak{G}) = \operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G}, \pi_t) = \operatorname{Val}(\mathfrak{G}, \pi_\infty) \le \omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G}).$$

But as  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{B_t} \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}} \supset \operatorname{IRS}(\mathcal{F}) \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ , we have  $\operatorname{Val}_{B_t}(\mathfrak{G}) \geq \omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G})$ . We are done.

### 3.3 Separation

We now get the separation directly from the main theorem of [BCV24]:

**Theorem 3.12** (TailoredMIP<sup>\*</sup>=RE). For each Turing machine  $\mathcal{M}$ , there is a non-local game  $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$  whose description can be computed in finite time from  $\mathcal{M}$  with:

- If  $\mathcal{M}$  halts, then  $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$  has a perfect permutation strategy.
- If  $\mathcal{M}$  does not halt, then  $\omega^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{M}}) < \frac{1}{2}$ .

Actually they proved something a priori stronger, that this is true when restricting to a class of games called Tailored non-local games. With this we can prove:

**Theorem 3.13.** There exists a non local game  $\mathfrak{G}$  with  $\omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G}) > \omega^*(\mathfrak{G})$ .

*Proof.* First note for each  $\mathfrak{G}$ , there is a computably enumerable sequence  $\beta_n$  that is increasing and converges to  $\omega^*(\mathfrak{G})$ , simply by doing an exhaustive search over finite dimensional strategies.

Suppose for all games we had  $\omega^*(\mathfrak{G}) \geq \omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G})$ . Under this assumption we will construct an algorithm for the Halting problem.

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Turing machine, and  $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$  the game from Theorem 3.12. On this input, our algorithm will alternate enumerating the  $\alpha_n$  from Theorem 3.6 and the  $\beta_n$  for  $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ . The algorithm will accept on the input if ever  $\beta_n \geq \frac{1}{2}$ . It will reject if ever  $\alpha_n < 1$ .

There are two cases: First suppose  $\mathcal{M}$  halts. This means there is a perfect permutation strategy and so  $\omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{M}}) = 1$  and  $\omega^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{M}}) = 1$ . So  $\alpha_n$  are always 1 and the  $\beta_n$  are eventually  $\geq 1/2$ . So the algorithm accepts on this input.

Suppose  $\mathcal{M}$  never halts. This means  $\omega^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{M}}) < \frac{1}{2}$  and so  $\omega_{IRS}(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{M}}) < \frac{1}{2}$ . In particular,  $\alpha_n$  is eventually < 1 and  $\beta_n$  are never  $\geq 1/2$ . So the algorithm rejects on this input.

We now combine the results of the paper to prove the main theorem:

*Proof of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2.* By Theorem 3.5 and 3.13 we see that there is a non co-hyperlinear IRS H on some free group  $\Gamma$ .

Since  $\operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$  and the set of co-hyperlinear IRS are closed convex sets, a seperation between them implies some extreme point of  $\operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$  is not co-hyperlinear. So there is some ergodic  $H \in \operatorname{IRS}(\Gamma)$  which is not co-hyperlinear.

By Proposition 2.17, this means  $L(\Gamma/H)$  is not Connes embeddable. By the discussion proceeding Definition 2.12, we have  $L(\Gamma/H)$  embeds into some  $L(\mathcal{R})$ 

where  $\mathcal{R}$  is an countable p.m.p. relation.  $\mathcal{R}$  can be chosen to be ergodic as H was ergodic.

Finally by [CDI22, Theorem D] we have  $L(\mathcal{R})$  embedds into some  $L(\mathcal{R}')$ , where  $\mathcal{R}'$  is a ergodic countable p.m.p. relation with property (T). Since  $L(\Gamma/H)$  was not Connes embeddable,  $L(\mathcal{R}')$  is not either.

# 4 Further Directions

Here are some future research directions:

- 1. Given a trace  $\tau$  on a free group (or any group), is there any way to determine if  $\tau$  arises from an IRS? An intrinsic characterization of this would be interesting. Maybe one could try to generalize the notion of an IRS trace to general  $C^*$  algebras if such a characterization existed.
- 2. [Bow+24] proved the existence of a non co-sofic IRS on free groups, and we proved the existence of a non co-hyperlinear IRS. So a natural question is, are these notions the same? If they are the same, then hyperlinearity and soficity is the same for groups.

If they are distinct, a naive application of non-local games will not help. The non-local game method for separating two convex sets  $B \subset A$  requires one to be able to have computable upper bounds for A and computable lower bounds for B. The issue is  $\omega^*$  cannot have computable upper bounds, otherwise it would be computable. So really, something novel is needed for this. Such a separation would be evidence for soficity and hyperlinearity not agreeing on groups.

It is not clear that they should be distinct either, perhaps ergodic theoretic methods could be used to show they agree?

We note that the existence of a Hilbert Schmidt stable group that is not permutation stable[ES23] implies a non co-sofic co-hyperlinear IRS on that group, but this does not extend to free groups.

# Bibliography

- [AGN17] Miklos Abert, Tsachik Gelander, and Nikolay Nikolov. "Rank, combinatorial cost and homology torsion growth in higher rank lattices". In: Duke Mathematical Journal 166.15 (Oct. 2017). arXiv:1509.01711
  [math]. ISSN: 0012-7094. DOI: 10.1215/00127094-2017-0020.
- [AGV14] Miklos Abert, Yair Glasner, and Balint Virag. "Kesten's theorem for Invariant Random Subgroups". In: Duke Mathematical Journal 163.3 (Feb. 2014). arXiv:1201.3399 [math]. ISSN: 0012-7094. DOI: 10.1215/00127094-241006

[AP]	Claire A	Anantharama	n and	Sorin	Popa.	An	introduction	to II1	! factors.
	en.								

- [BCV24] Lewis Bowen, Michael Chapman, and Thomas Vidick. The Aldous-Lyons Conjecture II: Undecidability. arXiv:2501.00173 [quant-ph]. Dec. 2024. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2501.00173.
- [BO] Nathanial Patrick Brown and Narutaka Ozawa. C\*-algebras and Finitedimensional Approximations. en. Google-Books-ID: F\_kjj0teG2IC. American Mathematical Soc. ISBN: 978-0-8218-7250-5.
- [Bow+24] Lewis Bowen, Michael Chapman, Alexander Lubotzky, and Thomas Vidick. The Aldous-Lyons Conjecture I: Subgroup Tests. arXiv:2408.00110 [math]. July 2024. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2408.00110.
- [Bro06] Nathanial P. Brown. Invariant means and finite representation theory of C\*-algebras. arXiv:math/0304009. Feb. 2006. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.math/0304009.
- [CDI22] Ionut Chifan, Daniel Drimbe, and Adrian Ioana. Embedding universality for II\$\_1\$ factors with property (T). arXiv:2205.07442 [math]. May 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2205.07442.
- [ES14] Gábor Elek and Endre Szabó. Hyperlinearity, essentially free actions and \$L^2\$-invariants. The sofic property. arXiv:math/0408400. Oct. 2014. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.math/0408400.
- [ES23] Caleb Eckhardt and Tatiana Shulman. On amenable Hilbert-Schmidt stable groups. arXiv:2207.01089 [math]. Feb. 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2207.01089.
- [ES24] Dominic Enders and Tatiana Shulman. On the (Local) Lifting Property. arXiv:2403.12224 [math] version: 1. Mar. 2024. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2403.12224
- [Gol21] Isaac Goldbring. The Connes Embedding Problem: A guided tour. arXiv:2109.12682 [math]. Sept. 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2109.12682.
- [Ji+22] Zhengfeng Ji, Anand Natarajan, Thomas Vidick, John Wright, and Henry Yuen. *MIP\*=RE*. arXiv:2001.04383 [quant-ph]. Nov. 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2001.04383.
- [KPS18] Se-Jin Kim, Vern I. Paulsen, and Christopher Schafhauser. "A synchronous game for binary constraint systems". In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 59.3 (Mar. 2018). arXiv:1707.01016 [math], p. 032201. ISSN: 0022-2488, 1089-7658. DOI: 10.1063/1.4996867.
- [Pau03] Vern Paulsen. Completely Bounded Maps and Operator Algebras. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. ISBN: 978-0-521-81669-4. DOI: 10.1017/CB09780511546631.
- [PT14] Jesse Peterson and Andreas Thom. Character rigidity for special linear groups. arXiv:1303.4007 [math]. Feb. 2014. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1303.4007.
- [Ver10] A. Vershik. Nonfree Actions of Countable Groups and their Characters. arXiv:1012.4604 [math]. Dec. 2010. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1012.4604.